Doc Code: AP.PRE.REQ What was a second of 1995, no persons are required to response to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to response to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to response to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to response to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to response to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to response to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to response to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to response to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to response to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to response to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to response to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to response to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to response to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to response to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to response to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to response to the Paperwork Reduction Redu		ind Trademark Office	PTO/ use through 07/31/2012. O e; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF s it displays a valid OMB co
8 /		Docket Number	
PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REV	IEW	944-003.151	-1
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the	Application N	lumber	Filed
United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to "Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450" [37 CFR 1.8(a)]	10/606,284	1	June 25, 2003
on3/4/10	First Named	Inventor	<u></u>
Signature Lovani Loff'	SEPPINEN		
	Art Unit		Examiner
Typed or printed Lorraine F. Kniffin	2618		Eugene Yun
This request is being filed with a notice of appeal.			
This request is being filed with a notice of appeal. The review is requested for the reason(s) stated on the atta Note: No more than five (5) pages may be provide		;).	
The review is requested for the reason(s) stated on the atta Note: No more than five (5) pages may be provide I am the applicant/inventor. assignee of record of the entire interest. See 37 CFR 3.71. Statement under 37 CFR 3.73(b) is enclosed.	<u> </u>	Zawis I	Signature
The review is requested for the reason(s) stated on the atta Note: No more than five (5) pages may be provide I am the applicant/inventor. assignee of record of the entire interest.	Franc	Zawis I	
The review is requested for the reason(s) stated on the atta Note: No more than five (5) pages may be provided. I am the applicant/inventor. assignee of record of the entire interest. See 37 CFR 3.71. Statement under 37 CFR 3.73(b) is enclosed. (Form PTO/SB/96) attorney or agent of record. 31 301	Franc	cis J. Maguire Typed 261-1234	Signature

This collection of information is required by 35 U.S.C. 132. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11, 1.14 and 41.6. This collection is estimated to take 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

2

forms are submitted.

*Total of



DOCKET: 944-003.151-1

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Re Application of: Pauli SEPPINEN et al

U.S. Serial No.: 10/606,284

Examiner: Eugene Yun

Filed: June 25, 2003

Group Art Unit: 2618

For: BLUETOOTH RF BASED RF-TAG READ/WRITE STATION

Mail Stop AF Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW ACCOMPANIED BY NOTICE OF APPEAL

Sir:

In response to the Final Action of October 14, 2009, Applicant requests review of the rejection prior to preparing an Appeal Brief for the following reasons:

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service on the date shown below with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Lorraine F. Kniffin

Dated: 3/4/10

DOCKET: 944-003.151-1 Serial No.: 10/606,284

REMARKS

This Request for Review is filed with a Notice of Appeal with fee in response to the Final Action of December 4, 2009.

Based on the claim language, the pending claims include a limitation where the mixer is configured to be operable in both of the two modes (emphasis supplied):

1. A dual mode transceiver, comprising:

a mixer; and

a controller configured to adapt the transceiver to operate in two modes operating either as a radio frequency tag reader or as a Bluetooth transceiver by changing reception and transmission capabilities of the transceiver, wherein the controller is configured to control the mixer to operate in both of the two modes, wherein the mixer is useable for said transceiver operating as said radio frequency tag reader or as said Bluetooth transceiver.

The prior art does not show or suggest the claimed invention as a whole and, in particular, does not show or suggest a controller configured to control the mixer to operate in both of the two modes, wherein the mixer is useable for said transceiver operating as said radio frequency tag reader or as said Bluetooth transceiver.

The Examiner raised an issue in the Advisory Action concerning the meaning of the above mentioned limitation. The Examiner stated in the Advisory Action that nowhere in the claims does it specifically state that the mixer must operate **only** in the Bluetooth or **only** in the

DOCKET: 944-003.151-1 Serial No.: 10/606,284

RFID mode. However, the claims include only a limitation that the mixer must be operable either of the two modes in some shape or form.

It seems that if the Applicants were to accept the interpretation of the claim or were to insert additional or substitute language suggested by the Examiner, then it could later be susceptible to an incorrect interpretation that the mixer must operate only in the Bluetooth or only in the RFID mode but not both, as claimed.

The claims the "mixer" in the singular and it is clear from the claim that the mixer is controlled to operate in both of the two modes. The mode in which it is operating depends on how the controller controls it.

It is of course true that the mixer is operating only in the Bluetooth mode when it is controlled to be operating in the Bluetooth mode and that it is only operating in the RFID mode when it is controlled to be operating in the RFID mode. But that is evident from the language of the claim as currently pending.

Review of the rejection and reopening of prosecution to allowance is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Francis J. Maguiré

Attorney for the Applicant

Registration No. 31,391

Tel.: (203) 261-1234